

5550000 DIRECTIONAL BORE
COMMENTS FROM INTERNAL/INDUSTRY REVIEW

Missy Hollis

414-4182

melissa.hollis@dot.state.fl.us

Comment: (12-12-12)

The "no compensation for failed bore paths..." and "no compensation until reports.." statements are included in Section 660. Do they need to remain in 555?

Response:

Erik Brueningsen

561-472-8137

erik.brueningsen@wantmangroup.com

Comment: (12-17-12)

As a consultant concerned with the locating, protection and coordination of the utility facility, and very aware of the impacts due to delays in construction they can cause, I noticed the final version removed of the requirement that the bore facilities to be readily located after installation (*Old 555-4.2 (h) Install all facilities such that their location can be readily determined by electronic designation after installation.*). During review the discussion may have pointed out this is also required by the UAM Section 4.3.3 (*4.3.3 Electronic Detection of Underground Utilities - The UAO shall make all new or replaced underground utilities within the R/W electronically detectable.*). I understand some hdd bores are currently not locatable. But again, as a consultant working with the roadway designers and dealing with the location of these facilities in the real world, I know I'd be happy if every bore was detectable. And, if the bore is not detectable, the accuracy of the asbuilt record plans become all that more important, see concern below.

Also noticed the spec was removed requiring as-built surveys utilize vertical DOT benchmark control. It appears as written, the asbuilt record plans must only show appropriate elevations referenced to a *permanent FDOT feature (mast arm foundation, manhole inlet cover, head wall, etc)*. Does this mean the feature then becomes an assumed local datum, ie not providing an actual elevation, but an elevation relative only to that feature, set at 100.00' for example. Also, not sure how permanent any of these features are if the bore is associated with a planned roadway reconstruction project, or by some accident or other, the feature is moved; none of these features may survive, and there is no provision for the documentation or restoration of that local assumed datum once the hdd bore contractor is gone.

These two sections, taken together, appear to reduce the controls over bore installations. Rather I think, based on the problems associated with the limited right-of-way, the Department may consider increasing these controls.

Just my thoughts, I was not involved in the spec discussions. And I may be missing something, I'm only reacting to the changes in the 555 spec section posted, my concerns may be covered elsewhere in the specs. Thanks.

Response:

Cheryl Hudson
414-5332

Comment: (1-7-13)

1. Add a reference to Section 635. (555-2 Materials was moved to 635)

Response: Materials are now described in Section 630. It is not necessary to reference Section 630; instead Section 630 references Section 555.
No change made.

2. **555-1.1** “The work specified in this Section documents the approved construction methods, procedures and materials for directional boring also commonly called horizontal directional drilling (HDD).” Section 555-2 Materials was deleted/moved. (Remove “materials” from this sentence?)

Response: Agree. “and materials” will be removed from the spec.
Change made.

3. **555-5.1(e) Boring Path Report:(e)** “Elevations and offset dimensions as required in 555-4.2 Reference is incorrect. (Change to 555-5.2?)

Response: Reference should be 555-3.2.
Change made.

Ben Burton
954-777-4567

Comment: (1-7-13)

1. Completely changing the payment method satisfies my biggest concern regarding the interpretation of the spec.

Response:

2. The new 555-6 states that “no compensation will be made for directional boring until a Bore Path Report has been delivered to the Engineer.” This is contradictory to the previous language that states there will be no direct compensation for HDD; it is to be included in the cost of the installed item. Is the intent to state that no payment for the “installed item” shall be made until the Bore Path Report has been delivered to the Engineer?

Response:

3. Language in old 555-2.1 (first sentence) has been removed that defines “product.” It is important to have a definition of what the product is, as this term is used throughout the specification.

Response:

4. If a casing is used, it has certain extra requirements defined in the specification in a few places, such as 555-5.2 (e). Nowhere is “casing” defined. Is it common knowledge as to what

differentiates a casing from the other “products?” Or should a definition be used so all understand the difference in a casing/conduit/duct/carrier pipe?

Response:

5. 555-1.2 states, “....serves as a conduit, casing, or duct for a carrier pipe.....” Section 555-2 (old) stated the carrier pipe is a product. This leads me to believe that 555-1.2 is incorrect in stating that a carrier pipe goes inside of a duct. If a carrier pipe does in fact go inside of a duct as stated in 555-1.2, would this duct not be considered a casing? Also, see my previous comment regarding a needed definition for casing.

Response:

Jennifer Williams
D3 Staff
850-330-1592
jennifer.williams@dot.state.fl.us

Comment: (1-7-13)

For underground infrastructure, as stated in comments for Section 660, “require the Global Positioning System/Geographic Information System coordinates to be recorded for future project infrastructure location, repair and addition to the ITS statewide database.” The benefits of providing GPS/GIS coordinates for fiber running lines would far outweigh any added time spent by a Contractor compiling the data.

Response:

Pat McCann
954-777-4387
pat.mccann@dot.state.fl.us

Comment: (1-11-13)

Stefanie, I did not this in on time.

D4 Const has the following comment:

555-2 Materials: This entire section has been deleted but not sure why. I would think we need something in this section to cover other db work besides signals.

Response: The only conduit installed for FDOT is for signals, lighting, ITS, and irrigation. The material requirements for this conduit have been moved to Section 630. The directional bore spec remains only for the installation method.

Utilities use conduit, but are not required to follow FDOT material requirements – only the Utility’s material requirements - per the UAM.

No change made.
